ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Total Metals By EPA Method 200.8

% Recovery:

Date Analyzed: 11/02/12 Matrix: Water Units: ug/L (ppb)	Client ID: Date Received: Date Extracted:	M09730 11/01/12 11/02/12
	•	11/02/12
	2.20.02.200	

Internal Standard:

Client:	Alaskan Copper Works
Project:	Metro Self Monitor M09730
Lab ID:	211019-01 x10
Data File:	211019-01 x10.037
Instrument:	ICPMS1
Operator:	AP

Upper Limit:

125

Lower

Limit: 60

Germanium	96
Analyte:	Concentration ug/L (ppb)
Chromium	520
Nickel	518
Copper	646
Zinc	30.9

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Total Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID: Method Blank
Date Received: Not Applicable
Date Extracted: 11/02/12
Date Analyzed: 11/02/12
Matrix: Water
Units: ug/L (ppb)

Client: Alaskan Copper Works
Project: Metro Self Monitor M09730
Lab ID: I2-747 mb
Data File: I2-747 mb.025
Instrument: ICPMS1
Operator: AP

Internal Standard: % Recovery: Lin Germanium 99

Lower Upper Limit: Limit: 60 125

Concentration ug/L (ppb)

Chromium <5
Nickel <1
Copper <1
Zinc <1

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 11/09/12 Date Received: 11/01/12

Project: Metro Self Monitor M09730, F&BI 211019

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 210553-11 (Matrix Spike)

				Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Sample	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	Result	MS	MSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Chromium	ug/L (ppb)	20	<5	94	93	71-130	1
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	4.21	92 b	90 b	71-120	2 b
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	2. 79	91	91	52-134	0
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	10.1	94 b	94 b	51-142	0 b


Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

	Percent						
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance			
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Criteria			
Chromium	ug/L (ppb)	20	92	80-119			
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	94	83-119			
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	94	81-120			
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	95	82-120			

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

- a The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.
- A1 More than one compound of similar molecule structure was identified with equal probability.
- b The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.
- ca The calibration results for this range fell outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.
- c The presence of the analyte indicated may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.
- d The sample was diluted. Detection limits may be raised due to dilution.
- ds The sample was diluted. Detection limits are raised due to dilution and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.
- dv Insufficient sample was available to achieve normal reporting limits and limits are raised accordingly.
- fb Analyte present in the blank and the sample.
- fc The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.
- hr The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. The variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.
- ht Analysis performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.
- ip Recovery fell outside of normal control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.
- j The result is below normal reporting limits. The value reported is an estimate.
- J The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate.
- jl The analyte result in the laboratory control sample is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- jr The rpd result in laboratory control sample associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- js The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- lc The presence of the compound indicated is likely due to laboratory contamination.
- L The reported concentration was generated from a library search.
- nm The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.
- pc The sample was received in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.
- pr The sample was received with incorrect preservation. The value reported should be considered an estimate.
- ve Estimated concentration calculated for an analyte response above the valid instrument calibration range. A dilution is required to obtain an accurate quantification of the analyte.
- vo The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.
- x The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.



ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Bradley T. Benson, B.S. Kurt Johnson, B.S.

3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 TEL: (206) 285-8282 e-mail: fbi@isomedia.com

November 9, 2012

Gerald Thompson, Project Manager Alaskan Copper Works 628 South Hanford Seattle, WA 98134

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on November 1, 2012 from the Metro Self Monitor M09730, F&BI 211019 project. There are 4 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures ACU1109R.DOC